

Race to the Top Panel Review by Applicant



For Florida, Phase 2

Selection Criteria	Available	Average Total Score	Average Total Score	Revi	ewer '	1	Revi	ewer 2	2	Revi	ewer 3	3	Revi	ewer 4	4	Revi	ewer	5
Status		Tier 1	Tier 2	Соп	plete	d	Com	pleted	#	Com	pleted	d	Com	plete	d	Com	plete	d
				Tier 1	Tier	2	Tier 1	Tier	2									
A. State Success Factors	125	109	112.2	114	116		109	110		103	108		111	116		108	111	
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	56.6	59.8	59	61		59	60		52	57		58	63		55	58	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.4	4.4	5	5		5	5		3	3		5	5		4	4	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	39.2	42.4	40	42		41	42		36	41		40	45		39	42	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13	13	14	14		13	13		13	13		13	13		12	12	
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	24.8	24.8	26	26		22	22		28	28		23	23		25	25	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17.8	17.8	17	17		17	17		20	20		17	17		18	18	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7	7	9	9		5	5		8	8		6	6		7	7	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	27.6	27.6	29	29		28	28		23	23		30	30		28	28	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5	
(ii) Improving	25	22.6	22.6	24	24		23	23		18	18		25	25		23	23	

student outcomes														
B. Standards and Assessments	70	65.6	68.2	67	67	68	68	67	67	62	70	64	69	
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	38	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	35	40	35	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	15	20	15	20	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high- quality assessments	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	17.6	18.2	17	17	18	18	17	17	17	20	19	19	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	40.6	41.4	45	45	40	41	39	42	37	37	42	42	
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4	4	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12.6	13.4	16	16	13	14	11	14	9	9	14	14	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement	6	4	4.6	5	5	5	5	3	6	2	2	5	5	

improvement systems

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3.8	4	5	5	4	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4.8	4.8	6	6	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	112.2	115.6	126	126	113	115	107	111	111	117	104	109	
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	18.4	18.4	20	20	20	20	20	20	17	17	15	15	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6.2	6.2	6	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	5	5	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	5	5	5	5	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6.2	6.2	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	5	5	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	47	48	51	51	48	48	44	44	48	48	44	49	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11.4	11.8	13	13	11	11	7	7	15	15	11	13	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7.2	7.4	7	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	7	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	24.4	24.8	27	27	26	26	26	26	21	21	22	24	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	18.8	20	22	22	18	18	20	20	15	21	19	19	

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	11.4	12.2	13	13		11	11	13	13	8	12	12	12	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7.4	7.8	9	9		7	7	7	7	7	9	7	7	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	11.6	11.6	13	13		12	12	10	10	13	13	10	10	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5.8	5.8	6	6		5	5	6	6	7	7	5	5	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	5.8	5.8	7	7		7	7	4	4	6	6	5	5	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16.4	17.6	20	20		15	17	13	17	18	18	16	16	
(i) Providing effective support	10	8	8.8	10	10		9	9	4	8	9	9	8	8	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	8.4	8.8	10	10		6	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	
E. Turning	50	44.4	47	46	48		46	46	43	46	42	47	45	48	
Around the Lowest- Achieving Schools		77.7							.3	. 0	u #_	.,	.5	.0	
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	10	10		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
						-									

(E)(2) Turning

(i) Identifying

(ii) Turning

around the lowest-achieving

schools

the persistently lowestachieving schools 34.4

4.8

29.6

4.8

32.2

| 33

31

32

32

33

around the persistently lowest- achieving schools														
F. General	55	53	53	54	54	54	54	54	54	50	50	53	53	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	8.8	8.8	10	10	9	9	9	9	7	7	9	9	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	
(ii) Equitably funding high- poverty schools	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	39.4	39.4	39	39	40	40	40	40	38	38	40	40	
(i) Enabling high- performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7.8	7.8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	7.6	7.6	7	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	
Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the	485	424.8	437.4	452	456	430	434	413	428	413	437	416	432	

applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)														
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*	15*	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500			467	471	445	449	428	443	428	452	431	447	

Total 500 439.8 452.4

	FINAL**		Revie			Revie	wer 2	Revie	wer 3	Revie	wer 4	Revie	wer 5	
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes								

^{*} Applicants are eligible for either 0 or 15 points in Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM. The total awarded to the applicant is not based on an average of individual reviewer scores in this section. Rather, 15 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score if a majority of reviewers determined that the applicant has met the STEM criteria (indicated by the individual reviewer entering 15 points in that field). If a majority of reviewers award 0 points in this area, 0 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score.

^{**} The applicant will be determined to have met the absolute priority if the majority of reviewers responded "yes".

